

**SCHEDULED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

No. 24-1113 (and consolidated cases)

---

**In the United States Court of Appeals  
for the District of Columbia Circuit**

---

TIKTOK INC. and BYTEDANCE, LTD.,

*Petitioners,*

v.

MERRICK B. GARLAND,  
in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States,

*Respondent.*

---

On Petitions for Review of Constitutionality of the Protecting Americans  
from Foreign Adversary Controlled Applications Act

---

**NOTICE OF INTENT OF PROFESSOR D. ADAM CANDEUB TO FILE  
AN AMICUS BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

---

David H. Thompson  
*Counsel of Record*

Brian W. Barnes

Megan M. Wold

COOPER & KIRK

1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

(202) 220-9600

(202) 220-9601 (fax)

[dthompson@cooperkirk.com](mailto:dthompson@cooperkirk.com)

[bbarnes@cooperkirk.com](mailto:bbarnes@cooperkirk.com)

[mwold@cooperkirk.com](mailto:mwold@cooperkirk.com)

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
Professor D. Adam Candeub*

August 2, 2024

**CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT  
PURSUANT TO CIRCUIT RULE 26.1**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1 and D.C. Circuit Rules 26.1 and 29(b), undersigned counsel certifies:

*Amicus curiae* is a natural person and as such has no parent corporations or stock.

/s/ David H. Thompson  
David H. Thompson

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*  
*Professor D. Adam Candeub*

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF**

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a), D.C. Circuit Rule 29(b), Professor D. Adam Candeub represents that he intends to participate in this case as *amicus curiae*. Counsel for the United States and all Petitioners stated that they do not oppose the filing of this *amicus* brief.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 29(d), *amicus* Professor D. Adam Candeub certifies that a separate brief is necessary to provide the unique perspective that given the national security threat posed by TikTok, the Protecting Americans from Foreign Adversary Controlled Applications Act is constitutional. This perspective is based on the collective experience of *amicus curiae* in security and defense policy, and thus is not amenable to a joint brief. Further, because *amicus* is not aware of any other *amicus* brief addressing these issues, he certifies pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 29(d) that joinder in a single brief with other *amici* would be impracticable.

Dated: August 2, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David H. Thompson  
David H. Thompson  
*Counsel of Record*  
Brian W. Barnes  
Megan M. Wold  
COOPER & KIRK, PLLC  
1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 220-9600  
dthompson@cooperkirk.com  
bbarnes@cooperkirk.com  
mwold@cooperkirk.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
Professor D. Adam Candeub*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 2nd day of August, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit using the appellate CM/ECF system.

Counsel for all parties to the case are registered CM/ECF users and will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ David H. Thompson  
David H. Thompson  
*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*  
*Professor D. Adam Candeub*